

comparison on the American stage; and it is
commonly held that, for the first time, it
will, wherever the English language is spoken,
on both sides of the Atlantic, be proclaimed
the dramatic genius of the world.

We were right at the outset then, in saying
that his advent here was an event of moment,
and we wish to crown it according to its due.
Let her friends, therefore, be proud of her; let
them leave her to go forth with us, and we
will return her to go forth with fame, so re-
warded with good fortune, that they will be
glad she knew herself as well as to go upon
the stage.

Congressional.

THIRTY-THIRD CONGRESS.

FIRST SESSION.

Senate—Wednesday, February 15, 1854.

The CHAIR laid before the Senate Lieutenant
Gibson's report of the exploration of the
valley of the Amazon, made under the direction
of Lieutenant Herndon of the United States
navy.

DUTY ON SPANISH VESSELS.
Mr. HAMLIN reported back the bill to repeal
the act imposing tonnage duties on Spanish ves-
sels.

WASHINGTON CORPORATION.
Mr. DAWSON, from the Committee on the Dis-
trict of Columbia, reported a bill conferring ad-
ditional powers on the corporation of the city of
Washington.

TEXAS NAVY.
Mr. RUSK introduced a bill to provide for the
surviving officers of the Texas navy.

FRENCH SPOLIATION BILL.
The Senate resumed the consideration of the
bill making provision for the settlement of the
French spoliation claims; and it was read a third
time and passed.

BILLS PASSED.
The following bills were considered and passed:
A bill to establish a land district in Florida, to be
called Tampa district.

A bill making San Pedro, in California, a port of
entry and delivery.

A bill to amend the State of Ohio the public
lands remaining unsold and unappropriated in that
State.

A bill relinquishing to the city of Dubuque certain
town lots in that city.

A bill making Pilaski and Baytown, in Florida,
ports of delivery.

RIVERS AND HARBORS.
Mr. STUART submitted the following resolu-
tion:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce be and
they are hereby instructed to report to the Senate, at as early
a day as one can reasonably be prepared, a bill making ap-
propriations for the improvement of rivers and harbors.

PROTECTION TO OFFICERS OF THE UNITED STATES.
Mr. TOOMBS submitted the following resolu-
tion:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be in-
structed to inquire whether any further legislation be ne-
cessary to protect the officers of the United States from
the United States in the discharge of their respective
duties, and that the committee report by bill or otherwise.

NEBRASKA—SLAVERY.
On motion of Mr. DOUGLAS, the Senate pro-
ceeded to the consideration of the bill to establish
territorial government for the Territory of Nebraska.

The last clause in the 14th section is in these
words:

"That the Constitution and all laws of the United
States which are in force within the said Territory of Nebraska
as elsewhere within the United States, except the 5th sec-
tion of the act preparatory to the admission of Missouri
into the Union, approved March 6, 1820, (which was sus-
pended by the principle of the legislation of the Territory
of Nebraska, and is hereby declared inoperative.)"

The question pending was the motion of Mr.
DOUGLAS to strike out the words "except the 5th sec-
tion of the act preparatory to the admission of Missouri
into the Union, approved March 6, 1820, (which was sus-
pended by the principle of the legislation of the Territory
of Nebraska, and is hereby declared inoperative.)"

"Which being inconsistent with the principle of non-
interference by Congress with slavery in the States and
Territories, as recognized by the legislation of 1850, con-
sidered by the committee measures, is hereby de-
clared inoperative and void; it being the true intent and
purpose of this act to exclude therefrom, but to leave the
people thereof free to form and regulate their own
institutions in no way subject only to the
Constitution of the United States."

Mr. HOUSTON resumed his remarks upon the
bill against slavery. He was opposed to the com-
bining the three measures of Nebraska, Kansas,
and the Missouri compromise into one measure.

He was utterly opposed to any interference
with the Missouri compromise, and he was utterly
opposed to the Richmond Enquirer, of February
10, in which his opposition to this bill was pro-
posed, and his conduct and motives condemned.

He said that he had sufficient reasons for
his opposition to this bill. He was opposed to com-
bining the three measures of Nebraska, Kansas,
and the Missouri compromise into one measure.

He was utterly opposed to any interference
with the Missouri compromise, and he was utterly
opposed to the Richmond Enquirer, of February
10, in which his opposition to this bill was pro-
posed, and his conduct and motives condemned.

He said that he had sufficient reasons for
his opposition to this bill. He was opposed to com-
bining the three measures of Nebraska, Kansas,
and the Missouri compromise into one measure.

He was utterly opposed to any interference
with the Missouri compromise, and he was utterly
opposed to the Richmond Enquirer, of February
10, in which his opposition to this bill was pro-
posed, and his conduct and motives condemned.

He said that he had sufficient reasons for
his opposition to this bill. He was opposed to com-
bining the three measures of Nebraska, Kansas,
and the Missouri compromise into one measure.

He was utterly opposed to any interference
with the Missouri compromise, and he was utterly
opposed to the Richmond Enquirer, of February
10, in which his opposition to this bill was pro-
posed, and his conduct and motives condemned.

He said that he had sufficient reasons for
his opposition to this bill. He was opposed to com-
bining the three measures of Nebraska, Kansas,
and the Missouri compromise into one measure.

He was utterly opposed to any interference
with the Missouri compromise, and he was utterly
opposed to the Richmond Enquirer, of February
10, in which his opposition to this bill was pro-
posed, and his conduct and motives condemned.

He said that he had sufficient reasons for
his opposition to this bill. He was opposed to com-
bining the three measures of Nebraska, Kansas,
and the Missouri compromise into one measure.

He was utterly opposed to any interference
with the Missouri compromise, and he was utterly
opposed to the Richmond Enquirer, of February
10, in which his opposition to this bill was pro-
posed, and his conduct and motives condemned.

He said that he had sufficient reasons for
his opposition to this bill. He was opposed to com-
bining the three measures of Nebraska, Kansas,
and the Missouri compromise into one measure.

He was utterly opposed to any interference
with the Missouri compromise, and he was utterly
opposed to the Richmond Enquirer, of February
10, in which his opposition to this bill was pro-
posed, and his conduct and motives condemned.

He said that he had sufficient reasons for
his opposition to this bill. He was opposed to com-
bining the three measures of Nebraska, Kansas,
and the Missouri compromise into one measure.

He was utterly opposed to any interference
with the Missouri compromise, and he was utterly
opposed to the Richmond Enquirer, of February
10, in which his opposition to this bill was pro-
posed, and his conduct and motives condemned.

He said that he had sufficient reasons for
his opposition to this bill. He was opposed to com-
bining the three measures of Nebraska, Kansas,
and the Missouri compromise into one measure.

He was utterly opposed to any interference
with the Missouri compromise, and he was utterly
opposed to the Richmond Enquirer, of February
10, in which his opposition to this bill was pro-
posed, and his conduct and motives condemned.

He said that he had sufficient reasons for
his opposition to this bill. He was opposed to com-
bining the three measures of Nebraska, Kansas,
and the Missouri compromise into one measure.

He was utterly opposed to any interference
with the Missouri compromise, and he was utterly
opposed to the Richmond Enquirer, of February
10, in which his opposition to this bill was pro-
posed, and his conduct and motives condemned.

He said that he had sufficient reasons for
his opposition to this bill. He was opposed to com-
bining the three measures of Nebraska, Kansas,
and the Missouri compromise into one measure.

He was utterly opposed to any interference
with the Missouri compromise, and he was utterly
opposed to the Richmond Enquirer, of February
10, in which his opposition to this bill was pro-
posed, and his conduct and motives condemned.

He said that he had sufficient reasons for
his opposition to this bill. He was opposed to com-
bining the three measures of Nebraska, Kansas,
and the Missouri compromise into one measure.

He was utterly opposed to any interference
with the Missouri compromise, and he was utterly
opposed to the Richmond Enquirer, of February
10, in which his opposition to this bill was pro-
posed, and his conduct and motives condemned.

He said that he had sufficient reasons for
his opposition to this bill. He was opposed to com-
bining the three measures of Nebraska, Kansas,
and the Missouri compromise into one measure.

He was utterly opposed to any interference
with the Missouri compromise, and he was utterly
opposed to the Richmond Enquirer, of February
10, in which his opposition to this bill was pro-
posed, and his conduct and motives condemned.

He said that he had sufficient reasons for
his opposition to this bill. He was opposed to com-
bining the three measures of Nebraska, Kansas,
and the Missouri compromise into one measure.

He was utterly opposed to any interference
with the Missouri compromise, and he was utterly
opposed to the Richmond Enquirer, of February
10, in which his opposition to this bill was pro-
posed, and his conduct and motives condemned.

He said that he had sufficient reasons for
his opposition to this bill. He was opposed to com-
bining the three measures of Nebraska, Kansas,
and the Missouri compromise into one measure.

He was utterly opposed to any interference
with the Missouri compromise, and he was utterly
opposed to the Richmond Enquirer, of February
10, in which his opposition to this bill was pro-
posed, and his conduct and motives condemned.

He said that he had sufficient reasons for
his opposition to this bill. He was opposed to com-
bining the three measures of Nebraska, Kansas,
and the Missouri compromise into one measure.

He was utterly opposed to any interference
with the Missouri compromise, and he was utterly
opposed to the Richmond Enquirer, of February
10, in which his opposition to this bill was pro-
posed, and his conduct and motives condemned.

He said that he had sufficient reasons for
his opposition to this bill. He was opposed to com-
bining the three measures of Nebraska, Kansas,
and the Missouri compromise into one measure.

He was utterly opposed to any interference
with the Missouri compromise, and he was utterly
opposed to the Richmond Enquirer, of February
10, in which his opposition to this bill was pro-
posed, and his conduct and motives condemned.

He said that he had sufficient reasons for
his opposition to this bill. He was opposed to com-
bining the three measures of Nebraska, Kansas,
and the Missouri compromise into one measure.

He was utterly opposed to any interference
with the Missouri compromise, and he was utterly
opposed to the Richmond Enquirer, of February
10, in which his opposition to this bill was pro-
posed, and his conduct and motives condemned.

He said that he had sufficient reasons for
his opposition to this bill. He was opposed to com-
bining the three measures of Nebraska, Kansas,
and the Missouri compromise into one measure.

He was utterly opposed to any interference
with the Missouri compromise, and he was utterly
opposed to the Richmond Enquirer, of February
10, in which his opposition to this bill was pro-
posed, and his conduct and motives condemned.

He said that he had sufficient reasons for
his opposition to this bill. He was opposed to com-
bining the three measures of Nebraska, Kansas,
and the Missouri compromise into one measure.

He was utterly opposed to any interference
with the Missouri compromise, and he was utterly
opposed to the Richmond Enquirer, of February
10, in which his opposition to this bill was pro-
posed, and his conduct and motives condemned.

He said that he had sufficient reasons for
his opposition to this bill. He was opposed to com-
bining the three measures of Nebraska, Kansas,
and the Missouri compromise into one measure.

avored: "May it please your honors, I have lived
fifty years in the past, and know every man who
lived here at all, and didn't know anything about
it, but the devil a distinction can you find in the
whole State than myself for the place. [Laughter.]
The question was then taken on the amend-
ment, as given above, and it was adopted—yeas
53, nays 35.

YEAS—Adams, Atchison, Bayard, Bell, Ben-
jamin, Bright, Brodhead, Butler, Cass, Clay-
ton, Dawson, Dixon, Dodge, of Iowa, Douglas,
Evans, Fitzpatrick, Fremont, Fremont, Hunt-
er, Jones of Iowa, Jones of Tennessee, Mason,
Moran, Norton, Pearce, Pettit, Pratt, Sebastian,
Siddell, Stuart, Thompson of Kentucky, Toombs,
Wood, and Williams—35.

NAYS—Allen, Chase, Dodge of Wisconsin,
Everett, Fish, Fox, Houston, Seward, Sumner,
and Wade—35.

Mr. CHASE moved to amend the section as
amended by adding thereto the following words:
"Under which the people of the Territories,
through their appropriate representatives, may, if
they see fit, prohibit slavery therein." He said he
desired to test whether the Senate would give
the people the power to protect themselves from
slavery.

Mr. BRADY said the senator could only test the
question fairly by inserting after the word "pro-
hibit" the words "or introduce."

Mr. CHASE said the senator might, at the
proper time, offer that amendment; but at the
present he wanted a vote on his own as it stood.

Mr. BADGER opposed the amendment as prac-
tically defeating the object of the words just put
into the bill by the yeas and nays. He proposed to
delete the bill to-morrow.

Mr. BROWN said he also desired to speak on
the bill. He did not admit the power of the
people of the Territories to legislate on this
subject.

Mr. CASS said the bill gave that power to the
people of the Territories, provided the Constitution
allowed.

Mr. BUTLER said that, if Congress had no
power to legislate on this subject, the people of
the Territories could not have the derivative
power to legislate on this subject.

After some observations by Mr. WELLER,
The Senate adjourned.

House of Representatives.
The SPEAKER laid before the House a com-
munication from the Treasury Department, en-
closing a statement of the commissioner of customs
in relation to the accounts due from more than three
years past by the State of Ohio to the
Committee of Ways and Means.

Five or six gentlemen presented amendments
which they intended to offer to the homestead bill;
but they failed to do so.

RELIEF OF THE UNITED STATES TROOPS.
Mr. BISSELL, from the Committee on Military
Affairs, reported back the House bill, as amended
by the Senate, for the relief of the United States
troops, who were sufferers by the recent disaster
on the steamer Star of the West.

Two of the three Senate amendments were
concurred in.

ERIE DIFFICULTY.
Mr. MILLSON, after saying that the Erie diffi-
culty, which gave rise to the bill to be considered
this morning, was a matter of local interest, and
that he had no objection to the bill, moved to lay
upon the table the motion heretofore made to re-
consider the vote by which that bill was referred
to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the
Union; and this was agreed to.

CAPITOL EXTENSION.
Mr. CRAIG, from the Committee on Public
Buildings and Grounds, reported a joint resolution
authorizing a supplemental contract for certain
marble for the Capitol extension. After explanation
by that gentleman, the bill was passed.

AMIN BEY.
Mr. PERKINS, of Louisiana, from the Commit-
tee on Foreign Affairs, reported a bill for the
relief of Wm. D. Porter, of the navy, authorizing a
settlement of his accounts for the bringing of Amin
Bey back from Africa, and for the expenses of his
voyage, charged (\$2,024) be found due. Referred to the
Committee of the Whole House.

SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES BY ARBITRATION.
Mr. BAYLY, from the Committee on Foreign
Affairs, to which was referred a large number of
bills, reported a bill for the settlement of inter-
national disputes by arbitration, and he was
instructed to ask that the committee be dis-
charged from the further consideration of the
same, and that the bill be laid upon the table.

THIS WAS AGREED TO.

HON. MEX. WALSH.
Mr. EWING rose to present the memorial of
certain citizens of New York, representing that
MEX. WALSH, a member of the House, is not a
citizen of the United States, and that he is natu-
ralized, and that he was born in Ireland. He
wished the paper to be referred to the Commit-
tee of Elections, of which he (Mr. Ewing) is a
member. Of course he did not wish to be
himself any further, as he should be very sorry to
part with his friend over the way.

The memorial was so referred.

Mr. WALSH said that the gentleman need not
trouble himself on that score.

DEFICIENCY BILL.
Mr. BRECKINRIDGE said he had been in-
structed by the Committee of Ways and Means
to declare their readiness, if it was the pleasure
of the House, to report a deficiency bill, that it
might be referred and passed.

HOMESTEAD BILL—NEBRASKA.
The House resolved itself a Committee of the
Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. OLDS in
the chair, and took up the homestead bill.

Mr. MEACHAM arose, and was proceeding to
discuss the bill, when Mr. RICHARDSON raised a question of order,
namely: The House having limited the debate to
the homestead bill, it was not in order to discuss
the Nebraska bill.

The CHAIRMAN decided that, inasmuch as the
homestead bill was made a special order, to the
exclusion of all other business, debate must be
confined to that measure.

Much confusion prevailed, amid which,
Mr. CAMPBELL appealed from the decision of
the chair; upon the question being taken,
yeas 55, nays 55.

Mr. MEACHAM resumed his remarks against
the enactment of the Nebraska bill, and contended:
First, there was no necessity for this safety-valve
to the Missouri compromise; secondly, that there
was no settlement of whites in Nebraska, and
only three whites there, aside from the
soldiers of the government, and the traders
under license of the Indian Department.
Could there, then, be any necessity for
forming the territorial governments of Nebraska
and Kansas, and inviting men to go and settle
in a government, at an expense of \$100,000?
Thirdly, the territory has been set apart, by solemn
treaty, for the occupancy of the Indian tribes
there congregated; and the government has
no right to give it to the whites. If those Indians
are not safe in that region, in what other province of
Jehovah will they be safe? Fourthly, he was
opposed to the bill because it proposed to destroy the
Missouri compromise.

He considered this contract complete and per-
fect, leaving no room for experiment. No man
was authorized or dared to say that the repeal of
this act is the free will offering of the north. As
yet but little resistance had come from the
section; but the reason is the people were abso-
lutely struck dumb by the audacity of the propo-
sition. They did not believe the effort would be
made, and they refused to take notice of it.
If those bills were passed, a more bitter and
prolonged non-slavery excitement would be raised
in the north than ever. It was expected and in-
evitable. The Missouri compromise shall be repealed,
he believed before God that no other will ever be
again made to harmonize conflicting interests be-
tween the north and the south. He believed that
this will not be the last which will be rendered
null and void.

Mr. FENIMORE (Mr. MEACHAM yielding) replied
to the remarks of Mr. SARRIS, of Virginia, con-
cerning the subject of the Nebraska controversy. He
denied the right of the gentleman to prescribe a
test for members on this floor. If the Nebraska
bill shall be presented to the House, he would find
that "softs" springing up all over the north.

The unoccupied part of the hour assigned to Mr.
MEACHAM in debate having been exhausted by Mr.
FENIMORE.

Mr. WHEELER obtained the floor.

A question arose as to whether Mr. FENIMORE
should continue his remarks, but it was finally de-
termined in the negative.

Mr. WHEELER said he rose to address the
committee with some reluctance, notwithstanding the
gratuitous assertion of the honorable gentle-
man from Alabama, (Mr. SARRIS), that he knew
(Mr. WHEELER) was anxious to make a speech for
his constituency.

When he arrived at that point in his political
career, he would state to the committee that he
held his place. Until then, he should at times,

despite the threats of power or executive prom-
ises, speak the honest sentiments of his heart in
behalf of an honest constituency. In the discharge
of his duty he should be honest and fearless. He
came here to sustain the principles of the demo-
cratic party, and to legislate for the common good;
not to pin his faith to the coat sleeve of any man
or any administration. He was here to do his
duty to his country and himself. If it is the dis-
charge of that duty he should use language gra-
tifying to the ear, attribute it to the plain
garb in which truth is clothed, rather than the
silk of the fashionable streets of any member of
this House.

The most despicable position for a man on this
floor was to have a motive for his vote and be
known to have it. He did not hesitate that such
has been the case; he did not say that the execu-
tive sword has been suspended over the head of
any member of this House; but did say there have
been some who, honored by a seat upon this floor,
have progressed in notoriety, and held conspicuous
places, when they did not enjoy the "largest
liberty" that, under the cowardly threat of deca-
pitation one friend and refusing to appoint another,
men have exposed themselves to the suspicion of
having forgotten their allegiance to their constitu-
ency and the common good.

He then reviewed several of the acts of the
House, and said that the gentleman who, at the other end
of the avenue a few days ago, a friend, looking at
his graceful columns and fine proportions, suddenly
exclaimed: "Ages ago, he was here." He was then
for the first time struck with the force of the an-
swer, "When asking why a certain member voted
as he did?" "Oh, he has an axe to grind." [Laughter.]
It seemed there was a great government
grindstone, the approach to which is guarded by
modern Cerberus, called "Yield-all." In order to
use this grindstone, you have to divest yourself of
all independence of thought or action; you are
to have no will of your own. Having constituted
yourself a "living corpse," you are at liberty to
give a keen edge to your axe, in order that you may
cut through the grating of principle, and seize full
hold of the spoils.

He then reviewed several of the acts of the
administration; and, in the course of his re-
marks, said that the President had disregarded
the principles set forth in the inaugural address,
and that the national end of the democratic party
have been overruled, and a man made the
chief adviser of the President who for a quarter
of a century warred against the party.

He then reviewed several of the acts of the
administration; and, in the course of his re-
marks, said that the President had disregarded
the principles set forth in the inaugural address,
and that the national end of the democratic party
have been overruled, and a man made the
chief adviser of the President who for a quarter
of a century warred against the party.

He then reviewed several of the acts of the
administration; and, in the course of his re-
marks, said that the President had disregarded
the principles set forth in the inaugural address,
and that the national end of the democratic party
have been overruled, and a man made the
chief adviser of the President who for a quarter
of a century warred against the party.

He then reviewed several of the acts of the
administration; and, in the course of his re-
marks, said that the President had disregarded
the principles set forth in the inaugural address,
and that the national end of the democratic party
have been overruled, and a man made the
chief adviser of the President who for a quarter
of a century warred against the party.

He then reviewed several of the acts of the
administration; and, in the course of his re-
marks, said that the President had disregarded
the principles set forth in the inaugural address,
and that the national end of the democratic party
have been overruled, and a man made the
chief adviser of the President who for a quarter
of a century warred against the party.

He then reviewed several of the acts of the
administration; and, in the course of his re-
marks, said that the President had disregarded
the principles set forth in the inaugural address,
and that the national end of the democratic party
have been overruled, and a man made the
chief adviser of the President who for a quarter
of a century warred against the party.

He then reviewed several of the acts of the
administration; and, in the course of his re-
marks, said that the President had disregarded
the principles set forth in the inaugural address,
and that the national end of the democratic party
have been overruled, and a man made the
chief adviser of the President who for a quarter
of a century warred against the party.

He then reviewed several of the acts of the
administration; and, in the course of his re-
marks, said that the President had disregarded
the principles set forth in the inaugural address,
and that the national end of the democratic party
have been overruled, and a man made the
chief adviser of the President who for a quarter
of a century warred against the party.

He then reviewed several of the acts of the
administration; and, in the course of his re-
marks, said that the President had disregarded
the principles set forth in the inaugural address,
and that the national end of the democratic party
have been overruled, and a man made the
chief adviser of the President who for a quarter
of a century warred against the party.

He then reviewed several of the acts of the
administration; and, in the course of his re-
marks, said that the President had disregarded
the principles set forth in the inaugural address,
and that the national end of the democratic party
have been overruled, and a man made the
chief adviser of the President who for a quarter
of a century warred against the party.

He then reviewed several of the acts of the
administration; and, in the course of his re-
marks, said that the President had disregarded
the principles set forth in the inaugural address,
and that the national end of the democratic party
have been overruled, and a man made the
chief adviser of the President who for a quarter
of a century warred against the party.

He then reviewed several of the acts of the
administration; and, in the course of his re-
marks, said that the President had disregarded
the principles set forth in the inaugural address,
and that the national end of the democratic party
have been overruled, and a man made the
chief adviser of the President who for a quarter
of a century warred against the party.

He then reviewed several of the acts of the
administration; and, in the course of his re-
marks, said that the President had disregarded
the principles set forth in the inaugural address,
and that the national end of the democratic party
have been overruled, and a man made the
chief adviser of the President who for a quarter
of a century warred against the party.

He then reviewed several of the acts of the
administration; and, in the course of his re-
marks, said that the President had disregarded
the principles set forth in the inaugural address,
and that the national end of the democratic party
have been overruled, and a man made the
chief adviser of the President who for a quarter
of a century warred against the party.

He then reviewed several of the acts of the
administration; and, in the course of his re-
marks, said that the President had disregarded
the principles set forth in the inaugural address,
and that the national end of the democratic party
have been overruled, and a man made the
chief adviser of the President who for a quarter
of a century warred against the party.

He then reviewed several of the acts of the
administration; and, in the course of his re-
marks, said that the President had disregarded
the principles set forth in the inaugural address,
and that the national end of the democratic party
have been overruled, and a man made the
chief adviser of the President who for a quarter
of a century warred against the party.

He then reviewed several of the acts of the
administration; and, in the course of his re-
marks, said that the President had disregarded
the principles set forth in the inaugural address,
and that the national end of the democratic party
have been overruled, and a man made the
chief adviser of the President who for a quarter
of a century warred against the party.

He then reviewed several of the acts of the
administration; and, in the course of his re-
marks, said that the President had disregarded
the principles set forth in the inaugural address,
and that the national end of the democratic party
have been overruled, and a man made the
chief adviser of the President who for a quarter
of a century warred against the party.

He then reviewed several of the acts of the
administration; and, in the course of his re-
marks, said that the President had disregarded
the principles set forth in the inaugural address,
and that the national end of the democratic party
have been overruled, and a man made the
chief adviser of the President who for a quarter
of a century warred against the party.

He then reviewed several of the acts of the
administration; and, in the course of his re-
marks, said that the President had disregarded
the principles set forth in the inaugural address,
and that the national end of the democratic party
have been overruled, and a man made the
chief adviser of the President who for a quarter
of a century warred against the party.

He then reviewed several of the acts of the
administration; and, in the course of his re-
marks, said that the President had disregarded
the principles set forth in the inaugural address,
and that the national end of the democratic party
have been overruled, and a man made the
chief adviser of the President who for a quarter
of a century warred against the party.

He then reviewed several of the acts of the
administration; and, in the course of his re-
marks, said that the President had disregarded
the principles set forth in the inaugural address,
and that the national end of the democratic party
have been overruled, and a man made the
chief adviser of the President who for a quarter
of a century warred against the party.

He then reviewed several of the acts of the
administration; and, in the course of his re-
marks, said that the President had disregarded
the principles set forth in the inaugural address,
and that the national end of the democratic party
have been overruled, and a man made the
chief adviser of the President who for a quarter
of a century warred against the party.

He then reviewed several of the acts of the
administration; and, in the course of his re-
marks, said that the President had disregarded
the principles set forth in the inaugural address,
and that the national end of the democratic party
have been overruled, and a man made the
chief adviser of the President who for a quarter
of a century warred against the party.

He then reviewed several of the acts of the
administration; and, in the course of his re-
marks, said that the President had disregarded
the principles set forth in the inaugural address,
and that the national end of the democratic party
have been overruled, and a man made the
chief adviser of the President who for a quarter
of a century warred against the party.

He then reviewed